

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request consideration of the subject application as amended herein. This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed May 19, 2005. Claims 1-3, 5-23, 25-38, 40-48, 50-52, 54, 57 and 58 stand rejected. In this Amendment, claims 1, 17, 21, 30, 34, 43, 45 and 53 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner has objected to claims 17, 30, 43 and 53 and requested Applicant to provide claim language that clearly and precisely defines the claimed invention. Claims 17, 30, 43 and 53 have been amended to clearly and precisely define the claimed invention. The amended language is supported by the Specification of the present application (e.g., see paragraph 78 of the Specification).

Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 14, 15, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25-29, 31, 33, 34, 37, 38, 40, 44, 45, 47, 48, 50, 54, 57 and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayer, et al., (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0178246, hereinafter "Mayer"), in view of Pellegrinelli, et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0010618, hereinafter "Pellegrinelli"). Claims 2, 22, 36 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Mayer and Pellegrinelli, and further in view of Brown, et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0020750, hereinafter "Brown"). Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Mayer and Pellegrinelli, and further in view of Takahashi, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,968,124, hereinafter "Takahashi"). Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Mayer and Pellegrinelli, and further in view of Patterson, et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0052941,

hereinafter "Patterson"). Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Mayer and Pellegrinelli, and further in view of Elliott, et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0064149, hereinafter "Elliott"). Claims 19, 32 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Mayer and Pellegrinelli, and further in view of Detlef, et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0112021, hereinafter "Detlef"). Claims 41 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Mayer and Pellegrinelli, and further in view of Wolf, et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0178380, hereinafter "Wolf"). Claims 42 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Mayer, Pellegrinelli and Wolf, and further in view of Garcia, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,883,170, hereinafter "Garcia").

Applicant does not admit that Mayer, Pellegrinelli, Brown, Patterson, Elliott, Detlef, Wolf and Garcia are prior art and reserves the right to swear behind these references at a later date. Regardless, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are patentable over the cited references.

Mayer discloses a method for analyzing a network configuration against a corporate network policy and determining violations against the corporate network policy. The analysis is performed using configuration data associated with relevant network devices that is stored in configuration files of these network devices. A network administrator can edit configuration files with his or her proposed data.

Contrary to the presently claimed invention, in Mayer, a network administrator updates configuration files by writing new data directly to the configuration files (Mayer, paragraphs 62 and 90). In the presently claimed invention, in contrast, configuration information specified by a user is first validated and then stored in a database. Subsequently, at least a subset of the configuration information is extracted from the

database, and a text-based configuration file including the extracted configuration information is generated.

Mayer does not teach or suggest validating configuration information specified by a user prior to storing it in a database, and then extracting at least a subset of configuration information from the database and generating a text-based configuration file including the extracted configuration information, as does the presently claimed invention. These features are included in the following language of claim 1:

... validating configuration information specified by a user prior to storing the configuration information in a database;
extracting at least a subset of the configuration information from the database; and
generating a text-based configuration file containing the extracted configuration information.

Similar language is included in independent claims 21, 34 and 45. Thus, the present invention as claimed in claims 1, 21, 34 and 45 is patentable over Mayer.

Pellegrinelli does not help Mayer to render the present invention unpatentable. Pellegrinelli describes a method for distributing performance data associated with a customer from a distribution site to a user site. Pellegrinelli discloses storing configuration information in a database. However, Pellegrinelli does not teach or suggest validating configuration information specified by a user prior to storing it in a database, and then generating a text-based configuration file including at least a subset of the configuration information extracted from the database. Hence, Pellegrinelli lacks the same features of the present invention that are missing from Mayer. Thus, the present invention as claimed in claims 1, 21, 34 and 45 is patentable over Mayer and Pellegrinelli.

Furthermore, the above features of the present invention are also missing from each of the other references (i.e., Brown, Takahashi, Patterson, Elliott, Detlef, Wolf and Garcia) cited by the Examiner. Accordingly, the cited references, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the present invention as claimed in claims 1, 21, 34 and 45, and their corresponding dependent claims 2,3, 5-20, 22, 23, 25-33, 35-38, 40-44,

46-48, 50-54, 57 and 58. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

In conclusion, applicant respectfully submits that in view of the arguments and amendments set forth herein, the applicable rejections have been overcome.


If the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Daniel Ovanezian at (408) 720-8300.

If there are any additional charges, please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.


Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 7/14, 2005


Daniel E. Ovanezian
Registration No. 41,236

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300



FIRST CLASS CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

Whereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

on

7/14/05

Date of Deposit

JUANITA BRISCOE

Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

Juanita Briscoe

7/14/05

Signature Date